

<b>AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION / <del>MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT</del></b>		1. CONTRACT ID CODE <b>J</b>	PAGE OF PAGES <b>1</b>   <b>6</b>
2. AMENDMENT/ <del>MODIFICATION</del> <b>0001</b>	3. EFFECTIVE DATE <b>02/08/02</b>	4. REQUISITION/PURCHASE REQ. NO.	5. PROJECT NO.(IF APPLICABLE)
6. ISSUED BY ROICC FIELD OFFICE PENSACOLA RESIDENT OFFICER IN CHARGE OF CONSTRUCTION 520 TURNER STREET NAS, PENSACOLA, FLORIDA 32508-5225	CODE <b>N62467</b>	7. ADMINISTERED BY (IF OTHER THAN ITEM 6) <b>SEE BLOCK 6</b>	CODE <b>N62467</b>
8. NAME AND ADDRESS OF CONTRACTOR(No., street, county, State and ZIP Code)		(x) <b>X</b>	9A. AMENDMENT OF SOLICITATION NO. <b>N62467-01-R-3130</b>
			9B. DATED (SEE ITEM 11) <b>02/08/02</b>
			10A. MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT/ORDER NO.
			10B. DATED (SEE ITEM 13)
CODE	FACILITY CODE		

### 11. THIS ITEM ONLY APPLIES TO AMENDMENTS OF SOLICITATIONS

☒ The above numbered solicitation is amended as set forth in Item 14. The hour and date specified for receipt of Offers ☒ is extended, ☐ is not extended. Offers must acknowledge receipt of this amendment prior to the hour and date specified in the solicitation or as amended, by one of the following methods:  
(a) By completing Items 8 and 15, and returning THREE copies of the amendment; (b) By acknowledging receipt of this amendment on each copy of the offer submitted; or (c) By separate letter or telegram which includes a reference to the solicitations and amendment numbers. FAILURE OF YOUR ACKNOWLEDGMENT TO BE RECEIVED AT THE PLACE DESIGNATED FOR THE RECEIPT OF OFFERS PRIOR TO THE HOUR AND DATE SPECIFIED MAY RESULT IN REJECTION OF YOUR OFFER. If by virtue of this amendment you desire to change an offer already submitted, such change may be made by telegram or letter, provided each telegram or letter makes reference to the solicitation and this amendment, and is received prior to the opening hour and date specified.

12. ACCOUNTING AND APPROPRIATION DATA (If required)

### 13. THIS ITEM APPLIES ONLY TO MODIFICATIONS OF CONTRACTS/ORDERS, IT MODIFIES THE CONTRACT/ORDER NO. AS DESCRIBED IN ITEM 14.

(x)	A. THIS CHANGE ORDER IS ISSUED PURSUANT TO: (Specify authority) THE CHANGES SET FORTH IN ITEM 14 ARE MADE IN THE CONTRACT ORDER NO. IN ITEM 10A.
	B. THE ABOVE NUMBERED CONTRACT/ORDER IS MODIFIED TO REFLECT THE ADMINISTRATIVE CHANGES (such as changes in paying office, appropriation, date, etc.) SET FORTH IN ITEM 14, PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF FAR 43.103(B).
	C. THIS SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT IS ENTERED INTO PURSUANT TO AUTHORITY OF:
	D: OTHER (Specify type of modification and authority)

**E: IMPORTANT:** Contractor ☐ is not, ☐ is required to sign this document and return \_\_\_\_\_ copies to the issuing office.

14. DESCRIPTION OF AMENDMENT/ ~~MODIFICATION~~ (Organized by UCF section headings, including solicitation/contract subject matter where feasible.)  
SOLICITATION N62467-01-R-3130, MULTIPLE AWARD CONSTRUCTION  
CONTRACT, GENERAL SOC (IDIQ)

THIS AMENDMENT IS ISSUED TO PROVIDE DATA OMITTED IN SOLICITATION AND TO PROVIDE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FROM CONTRACTORS.

**\*\*THE DATE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS FOR PHASE I IS HEREBY EXTENDED FROM NOON, 28 FEB 02 TO: NOON, 15 MARCH 2002.\*\***

ATTACHMENTS 1 AND 2 ARE INCORPORATED INTO THE SOLICITATION BY THIS AMENDMENT.

Except as provided herein, all terms and conditions of the document referenced in Item 9A or 10A, as heretofore changed, remains unchanged and in full force and effect.

15A. NAME AND TITLE OF SIGNER (Type or print)		16A. NAME AND TITLE OF CONTRACTING OFFICER (Type or print) <b>ALICE L OBERHAUSEN CONTRACTING OFFICER</b>	
15B. CONTRACTOR/OFFEROR  (Signature of person authorized to sign)	15C. DATE SIGNED	16B. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY _____ (Signature of Contracting Officer)	16C. DATE SIGNED

**AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N62467-01-R-3130, Phase I**

**TITLE: MULTIPLE AWARD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT, SOLUTION ORDER CONTRACT, INDEFINITE QUANTITY (IDIQ) CONTRACT FOR NAS PENSACOLA REGION; NAVAL COASTAL SYSTEMS COMMAND, PANAMA CITY AND NAVAL RESERVE CENTERS IN AL AND FL**

**This amendment is issued to provide clarification to questions from contractors. The date for receipt of proposals for Phase I is hereby extended from noon, 28 Feb 02 to noon, 15 March 02.**

**Proposals shall be provided to the following address:**

**ROICC Pensacola  
Attn: Ms Alice Oberhausen, Contracting Officer  
Building 746, 520 Turner Street  
Pensacola, FL 32508**

**Telephone number: (850) 452-4616 ext 146  
e-mail address: [oberhausenal@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil](mailto:oberhausenal@efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil)**

**\*Contractors shall acknowledge this amendment when submitting proposals.\***

**Solicitation N62467-01-R-3130**

The following Questions and Answers are provided regarding solicitation N62467-01-R-3130:

1. **Q:** Are there drawings issued yet for this solicitation?

**A:** No. There will be no drawings or specification provided under Phase I of the solicitation.

2. **Q:** As an 8(a) contractor, is the Small Business Subcontracting Effort required?

**A.** In reviewing the solicitation, it was noticed that section **(b) Participation of Small Businesses in the Performance of this Project** was omitted. This section is provided as **Attachment 1**. Both Large Businesses and Small businesses are required to submit information required by section (b).

**Small businesses are never required to adopt subcontracting plans for themselves or to submit such plans to the Government to obtain Federal contracts.**

**However, any company that receives a Federal contract over the simplified acquisition threshold must agree to provide maximum practicable opportunity to small, small disadvantaged, small HUBZone, women-owned small, veteran-owned small, and service disabled veteran-owned small businesses consistent with the efficient performance of the contract. This requirement is sometimes referred to as the “best effort” clause. It applies to small businesses as well as to other-than-small businesses. Attachment 1, incorporated herewith, provides specific information required for evaluation of proposals for this solicitation.**

3. **Q.** What process should be followed to receive a copy of our criteria evaluation upon completion of our response?

**A. Copies of the evaluations will not be provided.** After Phase I evaluations are complete, notices will be sent to the unsuccessful offerors. The offeror may request a pre-award debriefing by submitting a written request for debriefing to the contracting officer within 3 days after receipt of the notice of exclusion from the competition.

**Additional information pertaining to contractors’ rights for pre-award and post-award debriefings is contained in Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 15 at 15.505, Preaward Debriefing of offerors and 15.506, Postaward Debriefing of Offerors. Contractors may access the FAR via the internet at: <http://farsite.hill.af.mil>.**

**Solicitation N62467-01-R-3130**

4. **Q.** Will there be a pre-bid conference prior to submission of Phase I proposals?

**A. No.**

5. **Q.** After reviewing Phase 1 requirements, we feel that the desired proposal size of 40 single sided pages is not enough in order to have a complete proposal. We would request that you increase the amount to 80 to 100. Please advise.

**A.** As stated in the solicitation, it is **desired** that contractors submit no more than the 40 pages. It is not **mandated** that no additional pages may be submitted. However, in order to provide timely evaluations, it is desired that contractors follow the criteria set forth in the solicitation.

6. **Q.** Page 3, Para C, Prime Contractor references: In the fourth sentence the term, "Customer Evaluation Form" is referenced. Is this the same form which is titled "Contractor's Performance Questionnaire"?

**A. No.** The incorrect form was provided. The correct form is provided as **Attachment 2**. Please discard the "Contractor's Performance Questionnaire".

7. **Q.** Page 3, Para C Prime Contractor's references: In the ninth sentence it says, for the proposer to ask references for the information stated in (a) through (e). Is this information in addition to the "Customer Evaluation Form"? Are these two separate submittals or just the same thing? It will be extremely difficult to obtain this detailed type of information within the short bidding time.

**A. No.** You will see that the information contained in (a) through (e) is the information requested in the "Customer Evaluation Form". We do require this submittal.

8. **Q.** Page 4, Para D, Subcontractor References: This paragraph requires that the customer evaluation form be obtained for the various proposed subcontractors. This appears not to be beneficial since the subcontractors used on a project outside the Pensacola Region will likely not be used on a project within the Pensacola Region. Why go to all this bother. Most contractors will use local subcontractors. Is this the Customer Evaluation Form?

**Solicitation N62467-01-R-3130**

**A. The same “Customer Evaluation Form” provided as Attachment 2** of this amendment shall be provided to each of the subcontractors a prime contractor reasonably expects to use during the life of this contract. Whether you intend to use local subcontractors or not, the form should be provided to those subcontractors and submitted with the proposal.

9. **Q.** Under Section 00150 PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS, Paragraph III, Evaluation Factors for Phase I indicates the 4 factors listed (Factor A, Past Performance, Factor B, Technical Qualifications, Factor C, Scheduling, Factor D, Small Business Subcontracting Effort) are of equal significance (underlining in RFP). However, there is no grading criteria listed for these factors (ie Exceptional, Acceptable, Marginal and Unacceptable)

QUESTION (a): What is the grading criteria?

Response: The grading criteria was inadvertently omitted from the RFP. The following clarification is added to page 2, III. Evaluation Factors following the list of the four factors:

**Basis for Assignment of Overall Rating for Evaluation Factors:** Each evaluation factor in the technical proposal will be rated with one of the adjectives below, supported by a narrative documenting strengths and weaknesses:

**Exceptional, Acceptable, Marginal, Unacceptable**

Generally, Exceptional means the proposal exceeds the requirements of the RFP and award can be made without exchanges. Acceptable means the proposal meets the RFP and award could be made without exchanges. Marginal means the proposal does not meet the requirements of the RFP but could become Acceptable with minor revisions (provided the Government enters discussions). Unacceptable means the proposal does not meet the RFP requirements without a major rewrite.

QUESTION (b): Additionally, if Factors A through D are of equal significance(as identified above and in the RFP), then is the individual grading for each Factor (ie Exceptional, Acceptable, Marginal and Unacceptable) averaged to arrive at the Proposer’s Overall Rating?

Response: Evaluation factors are **not averaged**. Each procurement stands on its own and each proposal is evaluated against the criteria in the RFP. All factors are considered equally important and will be considered in determining the Overall rating of the proposal.

**Solicitation N62467-01-R-3130**

QUESTION (c): Based on QUESTION (b) , for example, if a Proposer receives 1 Exceptional Rating, 2 Acceptable Ratings, and 1 Marginal Rating, Will the overall Rating be Acceptable?

Response: This is speculative and depends on the circumstances of a specific procurement. Each Factor is considered a critical element in the success of the contract.

Generally speaking, any proposal receiving less than Acceptable in **any single factor** will receive an **Overall rating no greater than the lowest rated Factor**. A rating of marginal or unacceptable means that the proposal failed to meet the requirements of the RFP in some respect. The Government **may** decide to enter discussions, and if this occurs, contractors have an opportunity to submit additional data which may make a proposal Acceptable. As noted elsewhere in the solicitation, the Government reserves the right to make award **without discussions**.

QUESTION (d): If the answer to QUESTION (c) is NO, What would the Proposer's Overall Rating be? Why?

Response: This question is answered in Response to Question (c) above.

**This completes the list of questions asked by contractors and the Government's responses. Contractors are reminded to carefully read and respond to each element of the four Technical Evaluation Criteria listed. Phase I is a critical phase. Offerors are advised that the Government may determine the competitive range in Phase I without holding discussions just as it may make award in Phase II without holding discussions.**

**Solicitation N62467-01-R-3130**

**ATTACHMENT 1, AMENDMENT 0001 TO SOLICITATION N62467-01-R-3130**

Offerors must address the following subfactors in sufficient detail to allow proper evaluation and rating:

**(b) PARTICIPATION OF SMALL BUSINESSES IN THE PERFORMANCE OF THIS PROJECT:**

**LARGE BUSINESS OFFERORS**

1. Identify, in terms of dollar value and percentage of total proposed price, the extent of work you will perform as the prime contractor.
2. Submit with your proposal, a subcontracting plan for this project which shall include the total contract value (including all option periods), the dollar value and percent of the total subcontracted effort including the effort to LB, SB, SDB, WOSB, VOSB, HUBZone firms, and HBCU/MIs. Electronic copies of the Subcontracting Plan format can be found on the internet at [www.efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil](http://www.efdsouth.navfac.navy.mil) under "Business Opportunities/Available Documents" or by contacting the point of contact for this solicitation. If firm commitments to subcontract exist, list the subcontractors by name. Otherwise, list the type of services to be subcontracted. If the subcontracting goals proposed are less than the NAVFAC subcontracting goals, provide supporting rationale.

**SMALL BUSINESS OFFERORS**

1. Identify, in terms of dollar value and percentage of total proposed price, the extent of work you will perform as the prime contractor.
2. State the extent of work, including type and percentages, you plan to subcontract to LB, HUBZone, SB, SDB, WOSB, VOSB firms, and if applicable, HBCU/MI.

**JOINT VENTURES**

1. If you are submitting an offer as a joint-venture, identify for each member of your joint-venture whether the member is a LB, HUBZone, SB, SDB, WOSB, or VOSB firm, and, if applicable HBCU/MI; and the value in terms of dollars of the work to be performed by each member of your joint venture.

**2. The Government will evaluate your joint-venture as either a large business or small business based upon the information provided in 1., directly above.**

**ATTACHMENT 2**

**CUSTOMER EVALUATION FORM  
(FOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION)**

RATING SHEET FOR: \_\_\_\_\_ EVALUATOR \_\_\_\_\_

JOB TITLE: **Multiple Award Construction Contract** RESPONSE DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
**N62467-01-R-3130**

Please use the following definitions to rate this firm:

E: Exceptional: They were an exceptional firm in every way. Customer was very satisfied with final product

A: Acceptable: They were an acceptable firm that we would not hesitate to contract with again. Customer was satisfied with final product

M: Marginal: They were an unacceptable firm that barely met the requirements of the contract. Final product was minimally acceptable to customer.

U: Unacceptable: They were an unacceptable firm. Final product was not acceptable to customer.

**1) CUSTOMER SATISFACTION**

Compliance with contract requirements, conformance to standards of good workmanship and technical excellence. . A quality product was delivered to the customer at a reasonable price in a reasonable time frame.

CUSTOMER RATING OF THIS FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

**2) PARTNERSHIP**

Problems encountered were resolved in a professional spirit of teamwork and cooperation. Contractor provided alternative “win win” solutions for all parties. Contractor recognized and respected views and opinions of other stakeholders in the partnership.

CUSTOMER RATING OF THIS FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

**3) CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION/MANAGEMENT**

Submitted complete and accurate daily reports, work schedules, schedule of prices, shop drawings, etc. within the time frames established by the contract. Provided reasonable cost proposals for changed work.

CUSTOMER RATING OF THIS FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

**4) TIMELINESS**

Completed work in accordance with time schedule set forth in contract or by the modified contract completion date agreed to by mutual consent

CUSTOMER RATING OF THIS FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_



## 5) QUALITY

Utilized sound trade and construction practices that complied with state and local requirements. This includes all environmental compliance issues. Utilized quality materials. There was little re-work required and a minimum punch list. QC System routinely identified rework items without being advised of defects by owner.

CUSTOMER RATING OF THIS FIRM: \_\_\_\_\_

## 6) FUTURE BUSINESS

Using this firm's past performance as a guide, would you do business with this firm again?

YES: \_\_\_\_\_ NO: \_\_\_\_\_

1. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Please provide any additional comments on past performance that may be applicable:

[illegible]

(Recommended ltr to Offeror's References)

CLIENT/REFERENCE ADDRESS

**RE: SOLICITATION N62467-01-R-3130, Multiple Award Construction Contract**

We are in the process of submitting a Best Value Proposal for the subject project to the NAVFAC Field Office, Pensacola, FL.

The Navy is placing increased emphasis on best value procurements which combines technical and price factors in the award. As a result, they are requiring that offerors submit evaluations from past and current clients. Request you have your references complete the attached "Customer Evaluation Form".

(Signature)